



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/716,254	11/17/2003	Hai Deng	42P17284	6503

7590 12/14/2005

Edwin H. Taylor
Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman LLP
1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 94085

EXAMINER

OLSEN, ALLAN W

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1763

DATE MAILED: 12/14/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/716,254

Applicant(s)

DENG, HAI

Examiner

Allan Olsen

Art Unit

1763

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 November 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-46 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 29-46 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 17 November 2003 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date May 16, 2005.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-28, drawn to a method of forming a zeolite composite, classified in class 427, subclass 213.3.
- II. Claims 29-35, drawn to a method of forming a layer in an interconnect structure, classified in class, subclass.
- III. Claims 36-39, drawn to a method of forming an interconnect structure, classified in class 216, subclass 39.
- IV. Claims 40-46, drawn to an interconnect structure, classified in class 174, subclass 52.4.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II are related as combination and subcombination. Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed because the combination does not require dispersing zeolite particles to make a colloid. The subcombination has separate utility such as catalyst precursor.

Inventions II and IV are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2)

Art Unit: 1763

that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the process of claim 29 could be used to make a catalyst.

Inventions II and III are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct from each other if they are shown to be separately usable. In the instant case, invention II has separate utility such as preparing a structure that does not include both a via and a trench. See MPEP § 806.05(d).

Inventions III and I are related as combination and subcombination. Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed because it does not require that the zeolite-sol colloid be formed into a wet gel-zeolite composite. The subcombination has separate utility such as a method for creating a catalytic medium or a molecular sieve type material.

Inventions I and IV are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process

(MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the method can be used to make a catalytic medium or a molecular sieve type material.

Inventions III and IV are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case, the product can be made without including the step of providing an etch stop layer because the product does not required such a layer.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

In a telephone message from examiner Alanko to Ed Taylor on September 20, 2005, a restriction requirement was made. Subsequently, Ed Taylor made a provisional election, without traverse to prosecute the invention of Group I, claims 1-28. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 29-46 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

It is noted that as a result of the above restriction/election being unbeknownst to examiner Olsen a subsequent telephone restriction (11/10/05) and election (11/15/05) took place during telephone contact between examiner Olsen and Ed Taylor on November 10th and 15th, 2005. However, this subsequent restriction/election is withdrawn in favor of the earlier restriction and election as set forth above.

Drawings

The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference character(s) not mentioned in the description: 305, 415, 505 and 610. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d), or amendment to the specification to add the reference character(s) in the description in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(b) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application.

The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because reference character “710” has been used to designate the trench in both figures 7 and 8 as well as the zeolite-composite ILD in figure 8. Note discrepancies in specification paragraph [0025]. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application.

Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either “Replacement Sheet” or “New Sheet” pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Objections

Claim 16 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form because the examiner fails to see how claim 16 further limits the subject matter of claim 15. Applicant is required to cancel the claim, or amend the claim to place the claim in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim in independent form.

Claims 14 and 24 are objected to because of misspellings.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-4, 6, 8, 9 and 11-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ogihara's et al. US Patent Application Publication 2004/0091419 (hereinafter, Ogihara).

Ogihara teaches creating a colloidal zeolite-sol. Ogihara teaches the sol may comprise up to 30 parts by weight of zeolite to 1 part of silane. Ogihara teaches spin coating the zeolite -sol onto a semiconductor substrate. Ogihara teaches treating the sol under the same conditions that applicant teaches. For example, Ogihara and

Art Unit: 1763

applicant both dry the zeolite material, by heating under the same conditions, which results in: oxidizing the zeolite-sol; forming a gel-zeolite composite; calcining the gel zeolite-composite; forming an aerogel-zeolite composite. Ogihara teaches the zeolite-sol comprises silica. Ogihara teaches the sol comprises an alcohol such as methanol, ethanol and propanol. Ogihara teaches the sol comprises HCl. Ogihara teaches the sol comprises TEOS. See paragraphs: [0032], [0035], [0037], [0055], [0076], [0078], [0089], [0101], [0112] and [0126].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 5, 7, 10 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogihara.

Ogihara does not teach using vacuum conditions to dry the zeolite material.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to dry the zeolite material of Ogihara under reduced pressure condition because this is well known and widely used means of controlling the rate of drying.

Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogihara in view of Martin's US Patent Application Publication 2002/0197645 (hereinafter, Martin).

Ogihara does not teach dip-coating the zeolite-sol.

Martin teaches methods of coating layers of zeolite material on substrates (see [0217] and [0223]).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to dip-coat the zeolite sol of Ogihara because Martin teaches that dip-coating and spin-coating are functionally equivalent methods of depositing zeolite materials.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Allan Olsen whose telephone number is 571-272-1441. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 1-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Parviz Hassanzadeh can be reached on 571-272-1435. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Allan Olsen', with a large, stylized circular flourish at the end.

Allan Olsen
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1763